

September 11, 1953

Dr. E. L. Tatum  
Biology Department  
Stanford University  
California

Dear Ed:

My memory may be failing, but to the best of my recollection our agreement about reprints was that we (UW) would buy about 800, and would forward 200 of that AAAS paper to you. These are in the mail. There has been a heavy post-card demand, and in addition I have heard a number of compliments about the literary (as well as scientific) quality of the article. As these have been conspicuously missing in regard to other papers I had recently written, it is a fair conclusion that they apply to your own hand in this one. As to disposition of the reprints, I am beginning to think now we should have ordered considerably more, but we should have another opportunity when the AAAS volume appears. May I ask that you take care of mailings (from your own list, which is probably not very different from my own) to the Western US (let's say west of the Great Divide plus Denver) and to New Haven. Most of the requests (except those local to California) will probably be addressed here and will be so taken care of, unless I suspect them to overlap your list, and I will forward such to you. If within reasonable limits you do the same, we should be able to minimize duplication. If you have any simpler suggestions to take care of this trivial but fussy problem, please let me know.

I saw John Behnke here at the AIBS meetings. The great delay in publication of the Sex Symposium seems to be a result of their submitting the mss. to several printers for detailed, firm cost estimates. They are supposedly about ready to go to press. Behnke would prefer a single-column format, as I would, but Wenrich's paper has some illustrations which may demand a large page size, and in turn double columns. We agreed that the illustrations that Science could not handle should be left in, so the two papers will be slightly different. He also agreed that some action to improve the photo-engravure in Science was in order. Finally, he implied there was some disagreement on the question of providing reprints. However, I assume we have a firm commitment on this point which has not been discharged by the publication in Science.

We are at home now in a new house, but it would be an exaggeration to say we were completely settled, either there or at the lab. Our trip was, on the whole an exhausting one. All things considered, the only part we thoroughly enjoyed was our visits to PG and Stanford. We are both very grateful for the warmth of your (pl.) hospitality.

I am sorry now to have been so distracted that I could not profitably read that M.A. thesis (I forgot by whom) on amino acid inhibitions. If you think you could sometime entrust it (or a microfilm) to the mails, I would very much like to read it at some leisure. I would also be very happy to hear about any possible ~~recovery~~ preservation of biotin-dependence in 58-161, but if you or your student are too busy, we will be happy to check this ourselves if you have gotten the cultures out.

Here is a list of the E. coli cultures (other than W- ) that we have in lyophil:

K-12 (various re-collections)

58

58-161 (recent)

58-278

679

58-5636

58-2651

58-6313

679-183

58-4899

58-3356

58-610

58-580

58-741

58-309

679-662

679-680

y-9

y-10

y-40 (recent)

(Do you have any old tubes of this or other 58-161 derivs?

y-44

e.g. Y-87, Y-54, Y-68, Y-78, Y-83, Y-84, 90-92,  
101, 103; 104 ??

y-51

y-46

y-53

y-70

y-105

y-109

y-118

y-120

y-132

y-133

y-138

y-161

B

ML

quite a few misc. wild types.

Some of these date back to 1946, and have not been rechecked.

Sincerely.

Joshua Lederberg